

Data Quality Assessment Report

Government Accountability Improves Trust (GAIT II)

Presented to the Democracy and Governance Strategic Objective Team
USAID/GHANA, Accra

By

Patrick Fosu-Siaw
Robert J. Groelsema (Team Leader)
Clement Tandoh

April 2005



USAID | **GHANA**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

I. Introduction to the Data Quality Assessment (DQA)

GAIT II was launched in August 2004 and is jointly implemented by the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA), Education Development Center (EDC) and Research Triangle Institute (RTI). As in GAIT I (Government Accountability Improves Trust), GAIT II seeks to improve local government performance through citizen involvement. The basic approach is to strengthen partnerships between district assemblies and community-based organizations so that public decisions are acted upon effectively and accountably. GAIT II integrates more fully democracy and governance (DG) and education goals at the local level with the aim of increasing community advocacy for and contribution to quality education.

The rationale for conducting this DQA hinged upon concerns raised in an assessment of GAIT I having to do with performance management. Accordingly, the DG SO team felt that it was important to ensure that (1) findings and recommendations from the assessment of GAIT I were being heeded,¹ and (2) that potential data issues for GAIT II were flagged and addressed early in the program.²

The assessment took place in Ghana from 22 March to 12 April 2005.³ Following an initial meeting with GAIT II leaders and staff in Accra, the team spent twelve days in the five GAIT II (Cohort I) districts.⁴ On April 7 and 8 the team conducted an indicators workshop with GAIT II staff and selected program participants from the field.⁵ The purpose of the workshop was to review and finalize indicators for the GAIT II program. On Monday, April 11 the team presented its findings to the USAID Mission, and in a separate meeting to the GAIT II team in Accra.

While in the field, the assessment team conducted interviews with GAIT II staff, including the District Technical Assistants (DTAs), Civic Union (CU) and Education Facilitators. Much like the facilitators in GAIT I, DTAs mobilize, counsel, encourage, and educate stakeholders and beneficiaries of the program. The CU and Education Facilitators are recent university graduates performing a required year of service as National Service Personnel (NSP). Based on conversations with these staff members, the team conducted subsequent interviews with key informants including district officials and civil society representatives who had participated in baseline focus groups (FGs). The team also interviewed District Monitoring Assistants (DMAs) and District Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) officers of the Ghana Education Service (GES), who acted as “raters” of the FG sessions and Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) exercises. Meetings were also held with leaders of CUs, District Assembly (DA) executives, members of the

¹ Conducted in November 2003; report dated December 8, 2003.

² No DQA of GAIT I had been conducted.

³ The team consisted of Patrick Fosu-Siaw (Accra/PSO), a monitoring and evaluation specialist with USAID/Ghana; Clement Tandoh (Accra/DG), a local government/district assembly specialist and GAIT II co-CTO with USAID/Ghana; Elsie Menorkpor (Accra/EDU), an education specialist and GAIT II co-CTO with USAID/Ghana. Ms. Menorkpor was with the team in West Gonja and Bole Districts. The team leader, Robert Groelsema (DCHA/DG), is a civil society specialist with USAID/Washington. Ted Lawrence, the DG SO Team Leader was joined the team in Bole, Ho, and South Tongu Districts.

⁴ The GAIT II (Cohort I) districts are Suhum-Krabo-Coaltar (referred to as Suhum), West Gonja, Bole, Ho and South Tongu (Suhum also participated in GAIT I). In the life of the project, 10 districts will be added each year in years two and three, and will be identified as Cohorts II and III.

⁵ See Appendix Two for a list of attendees.

District Education Office (DEO), and selected Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as well as School Management Committees and Parent Teacher Associations (SMC/PTAs). A list of interviewees may be found in Annex Three.

Over the course of the interviews, the team became aware of management issues concerning staffing, organization, and logistics, and these concerns are addressed in the report in so much as they are relevant to the success of the GAIT II program. Nonetheless, in keeping with the Scope of Work (SOW), the team focused on assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the data collection methodology, the quality and accuracy of the baselines and targets, the appropriateness of the indicators, and the presentation and analysis of data in the GAIT II Baseline Report.⁶

For their help in the field, the team would like to recognize GAIT II M&E staff Albert Nyarko, Reynolds Kissiedu and Oliver Eleeza, all of whom proved to be of immense help to the team.

II. General Findings

1. GAIT II's baseline collection process is rigorous, although extremely complex. GAIT II was not always able to follow its established procedures, and rarely were exceptions to the stated methodology acknowledged in the Baseline Report. Further, the Baseline Report failed to discuss threats to the validity and reliability of the data, which might be anticipated in rural Ghana. Fortunately, the results appear to be within the range of what is predictable, and the team's conclusion is that in spite of issues with the methodology, the data is of sufficient quality that collecting new baseline data will not be necessary.
2. Data gathering and reporting is stove-piped between DG and Education resulting in parallel M&E systems. At the district level, DTAs collect monthly reports from Education CFs and forward them to the Zonal Education Coordinators, who in turn relay them to the Education Coordinator in Accra. The Education M&E was designed by EDC with little participation by the rest of GAIT II. EDC pays for the M&E. Stove-piping means that many GAIT II staff will be less informed about education activities and exercise less voice in education matters.
3. M&E systems are Accra-centric. The design, analysis, and reporting are concentrated in Accra. GAIT II field staff, and members of DAs and CUs had no input in the design of baseline collection, demonstrated little or no understanding of the program's M&E system, and were unfamiliar with baselines, targets, and indicators and how they were selected. Thus, they participated in the FG discussions without fully understanding or appreciating its use and/or importance. The DG side of the system relies almost exclusively upon the M&E coordinator. Presently the M&E coordinator must travel upcountry, collect DG-related data, return with it to Accra, and store it on his laptop computer. Zonal M&E Assistants have had their assignments for some two months, but say they do not have job descriptions and have not been trained. One result of this arrangement is that field staff do not know their individual district baselines and targets. Without targets, district staff cannot be held accountable for results.
4. Many, but not all concerns of the GAIT I assessment are being addressed. The GAIT I assessment recommended that M&E clearly show how impact is measured. This

⁶ Dated March 18, 2005.

recommendation is being taken seriously through GAIT II's efforts to improve its indicators. However, the GAIT I report advised that "reporting requirements needed to be clear and balanced" (p.5). At this stage of GAIT II, clarity and balance in analysis and reporting remain problematic. Sustainability of CUs—also raised in the GAIT I assessment—has not been considered adequately in GAIT II.

5. Collaboration between Education Quality for All (EQUALL) and GAIT II is weak. Education and DG facilitators work independently; DA staff and CUs generally do not know the education facilitators. Although the team did not meet EQUALL district supervisors, the team learned that DTAs and EQUALL district supervisors were not collaborating. DTAs and GAIT II community facilitators were not well informed about EQUALL goals and activities even though they work in the same school communities.
6. Although in some districts DEO staff has only recently been introduced to the CFs, and in other districts, DEO staff is still unaware of the CFs, these young NSP are impressive and appear to be a great asset to GAIT II. Nonetheless, some concerns were brought to the team. Facilitators rely on public transport and sometimes wait long periods for transport, and then walk considerable distances to their schools. In addition, they serve for one year, and it is unclear what impact their departure from the program will have.
7. GAIT II offices have not set an example for the participatory, friendly, educational environments GAIT II expects from the DAs. Where they exist (*Ho and Sogakope do not yet have offices*), GAIT II offices are not welcoming. They do not have signage, are not well-lit, do not have 'talking walls', are minimally functional, and in some cases vary considerably in institutional arrangements. In Suhum, GAIT II and the CU share a single room at the Community Center. In Damongo, GAIT II has a room within the DA building. The new zonal office in Wa is located 2 ½ miles from the town center while the CU in Wa does not have an office. The most satisfactory arrangement appeared to be in Bole where the DTA, the CFs, and the CU will be housed within a three-room building.

III. Baselines

The team found a number of methodological and reporting concerns relating to the baseline data. Below are some examples:

1. Focus Groups (FG) and Participatory Learning and Action (PLA)
 - CSO sample size for the Focus Groups (FG) varied from nine CSOs to two CSOs per district (as opposed to the stated five CSOs per district).
 - Many CSO and some DA participants did not know the purpose of the FG exercise, did not understand why their organization had been selected or how they were chosen.
 - Baseline results were promised to participants of FG sessions, but had not been disseminated. Participants were not informed about when they should expect to receive the results.⁷

⁷The M&E Coordinator said GAIT II was waiting for the DQA before disseminating FG results.

- PLA exercises were conducted successfully, although minor issues were brought to the attention of the team. Bole CFs did not participate in the PLA exercise for their district, and in some districts the youth were not interviewed as a group. Some facilitators observed that the three-day timeframe per community was so fatiguing that they were too tired at the end of the day to conduct their debriefing exercises. In some cases teams had three instead of the required four persons. Further, training did not include practice sessions in the target language, which required lots of improvisation. Finally, difficulty in rounding up villagers in the communities resulted in lots of waiting and down time.

2. Performance Components and Rating Instruments

- Rating instruments (Performance Component Assessment Instruments--PCAI) were used to score performance of DAs, CSOs, and DEOs. The instruments can be difficult to score and interpret because of (1) their technical and sometimes ambiguous wording; (2) multiple actions contained in a single element; and (3) elements that do not pertain to the behavior/practice being measured. An element with multiple actions like "DA uses citizens involvement techniques such as roundtables, town meetings, public hearings, information sharing sessions, focus groups" can be difficult to rate.
- Misunderstandings over terminology occurred between facilitators and raters in the conduct of the FGs. At times the raters had to interrupt the facilitators during the sessions to ask clarifying questions.⁸
- No field pretest of the CPGI instrument/questionnaire was conducted, although informal testing was done at a stakeholders' workshop at Abokobi where GAIT II staff, raters, CU representatives and DA officials participated.
- The definition of 'advocacy' included a broad spectrum of activity from installing speed ramps to undertaking tax stamp policy. Ambiguity could result from the subjective use of terms such as 'effective advocacy'. It is not clear whether the raters and participants had a common understanding of the term. The definition on the existing PIRS allowed a broad range of actions from a one-off request for street lighting to a complex advocacy agenda to be counted equally.
- The DA Performance Index has no "transparency" component; the PTA Performance Index has no "advocacy" component, yet there is an "advocacy" component for the DEO Performance Index; and the PTA Performance Component Index #3 is more about "responsiveness" than about "networking and coalition-building."
- In all there are twenty-two performance assessment components, each performance component is utilized as a separate instrument, and each instrument has 10-15 performance elements, which are scored by non-DG specialists. Opportunities for error increase with complexity.

3. Rating and Scoring Issues

⁸ In S. Tongu district, the words "monitoring indicators" and "success indicators" were used variably by CFs and the GES staff to mean the same thing.

- Unevenness among the CSO responses during the FG sessions made it difficult to evaluate across CSOs and to draw conclusions regarding CSO capacity. Some hedging on answers by CSOs was noted by the observers.
- In Suhum, some doubt about the impartiality of the raters arose given that raters came from the district where the FG sessions were conducted. Participants' answers and raters' scores may have been affected by the fact that raters and participants knew each other.
- Some raters were not fully committed to the FG exercise, and abandoned it when a better offer came along (i.e., a higher per diem rate) forcing the GAIT II team to substitute untrained raters at the last minute (as in W. Gonja).
- No consensus rating was conducted for W. Gonja.

4. The Baseline Report

The report was a refreshing improvement over GAIT I. Nonetheless, a number of improvements could have been made, which would have made the report easier to read and comprehend. The report restated rather than analyzed findings, and should have offered explanations for anomalies or made programmatic recommendations based on the analysis. Long lists of bulleted points were difficult to analyze. Examples:

Errors

- The SO level baseline (p. 19) was stated as 'one', but should have been "zero." No district exceeded average performance.
- The report mentions that "three leaders from each sampled group represented their groups." In some cases there were more and sometimes fewer than three.

Omissions

- The report did not attempt to identify, discuss, explain or resolve the numerous challenges and problems encountered with the baseline process.
- On page 8, the report offers a heading, "sampling design," but fails to mention what is being sampled.
- The report did not include baseline tables for the CSO (IR5.3) performance indicators.
- The "formal mechanisms for collaborative budgeting" mentioned on page 11 were not described.

Inconsistencies

- The inclusion of Suhum, a GAIT I district, in the GAIT II cohort skews comparisons of results.
- The report mentions, but does not define "six focus areas" used to measure progress toward achieving the SO-level indicator.
- One of the six focus areas, 'Transparency and Accountability' does not appear as a component in any performance index.
- On page 9, it is not clear how the "inter-reliability" study is a check on "validity" as the report claims.

- On page 10, the report states that “no GAIT II districts exceeded average performance on the rating scale.” The next sentence contradicts this statement by saying that Suhum-Krabo-Coaltar achieved average performance.
- The ‘notable disparity’ mentioned on page 10 requires explanation because the difference between an ‘average level of performance’ and ‘very slightly above average performance’ would seem insignificant.

Ambiguities

- The use of the term ‘partner group’ is confusing. The report names four partner groups: CSOs, DAs, DEOs and support institutions (ILGS and NALAG) on one page, and on another page talks about four key partner groups: Citizen groups, DAs, PTAs, and DEOs (to which performance ratings are applied).

Restatements

- On page 12, the bullets restate the findings in the table.

Analysis

- Page 10 and 11 mention how districts fared on the various focus levels. However, without a definition of the focus areas, and in the absence of an attempt to explain what these scores mean, and what their implications are for programming, it is difficult to know what to do with the information.
- Tables 1 and 2 on pages 10 and 12 show that the five GAIT II (Cohort 1) districts fared about as well as five GAIT I districts (Cohort I). On DA performance in participatory budget process they all scored average or below average—despite the substantial advantages and years of experience enjoyed by GAIT I districts. Similar comparisons may be made on baseline results contained in Table 4 on page 14 and Table 5 on page 15. The results in these tables raise lots of questions about the program that the report should have addressed. Additionally, if a GAIT I Cohort 1 district scores a “low” rating after several years of intervention (as is seen in Table 4, page 14) an explanation should be offered.
- On page 1 it is not clear how the report concluded that “high levels of apathy” account for low advocacy performance in Ho. It is also unclear why Suhum should be different than the “four weaker districts [where] most citizen group members are occupied with earning a living and less inclined to get involved in civic activities.”
- It would have been helpful to give the baseline results by district, and then to compare districts to each other.

Bulleted Items

- Pages 1 and 2 offer a long list of bulleted highlights that would be more meaningful if grouped into analytic categories.

IV. Targets

Utilizing existing baseline data, targets will need to be readjusted to reflect changes made to the indicators. GAIT II is expected to reset targets as necessary (for IRs 5.2 and 5.3) and to submit new targets to the Mission (date TBD). Over the course of the assessment, the following concerns were raised:

- GAIT II indicators report on aggregated results from the district-level. It is unclear whether targets for individual districts exist, and how progress toward achieving them is being measured.
- GAIT II field staff was not involved in setting targets, did not have an opinion on the reasonableness of the targets, and did not understand the process by which targets were established. DTAs and CFs did not have copies of baselines and targets.
- An informal poll of the CFs at the meeting in Bole District that showed that 80% (16/20) PTAs had an operational School Performance Improvement Plan (SPIP) and 0% (0/20) PTAs were monitoring school performance. In Ho a similar poll found that (24/28) PTAs had an operational SPIP and less than 10% of the PTAs were monitoring school performance. These findings raised questions about whether CFs understood the indicators in the same way that the M&E staff did, and whether the targets for indicators IR8.4 #1 and IR8.4 #3 need to be adjusted.
- It is potentially confusing for school communities that the World Bank capitation grant schools also require SPIPs (as in Bole and W. Gonja).

V. Indicators

While in the field, the team began working with the GAIT II M&E Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator on indicators. It became evident that an indicators workshop would be necessary to review and reformulate certain indicators, and to design a new gender indicator. Consequently, the team invited GAIT II headquarters and selected field staff, a DA and CU partner representative, and USAID Program, Education, and DG staff to an indicators session at the GAIT II office on April 7 and 8 in Accra. A list of issues and proposals for revisions is found in Annex Four and the revised Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)—which were products of the workshop—are found in Annex Five. It was agreed that GAIT II and USAID would hold a target setting workshop in Accra to reflect changes to the indicators.

Some examples of the issues raised were:

- Field staff in the districts was unfamiliar with the indicators.
- The reporting period needed to be clarified. GAIT II was planning to report from August 1 to July 31. The team recommended that Year 1 and subsequent years be defined as the USAID fiscal year, starting October 1 and ending September 30. For Year 1, data would be collected from the launching of GAIT II (August 1) up to 30 September 2005.
- Four of seven IR5.2 and IR5.3 indicators showed no progress in Year 1, and two of them showed no progress from Year 2 to Year 3. (IR5.2 #1 and #2 are time lagged, and will not be reported on in Year 1). The inability to show progress presented a reporting problem for the Mission.
- Some indicators had multiple (double-barreled) elements.
- It seemed important to be able to differentiate between simple “one-off” advocacy activities and activities requiring concerted long-term effort.

VI. Data Gathering and Reporting System

- The over-centralization of the data performance system in the M&E unit in Accra excludes field staff from the process. The (DG) data ride upon the M&E specialist who must go to the field to pick it up, verify that it has been collected properly, and then analyze it and report on it from Accra—a huge task.
- Separation of ED M&E from DG reinforces stove-piped implementation of the GAIT II program.
- GAIT II plans to design an electronic reporting system to alleviate some of the burden on HQ M&E staff. The details of how this system will work and when it will be operational are unknown.
- GES data gatherers who come from outside the districts provide objectivity and checks and balances on collection procedures, but they entail significant transaction costs in training, scheduling, travel costs, meals, and accommodations.
- It is unclear whether data are sufficiently backed-up in the field and in Accra for safe storage.

VI. Recommendations

“If you don’t know where you’re going, any road will get you there.” It is vital to involve stakeholders--DTAs, facilitators, CU executives, and key DEO and DA personnel—in the success of GAIT II. They should set targets for themselves and their communities, and should measure their progress toward their goals. Broad ownership of program performance would create a greater awareness of goals, and also would produce tangible targets with predictable results. M&E can be intimidating, but one GAIT II field leader expressed his passion to learn about it and to be more involved in the process.

- Baselines, targets, and indicators ought to involve community stakeholders and GAIT II field staff. These stakeholders should help set individual, group, and district targets. Moreover, they need to understand the power of setting and tracking targets and why targets are so vital to program performance. They need to know their district targets and how meeting their targets will contribute to achieving country-wide goals and objectives. Further, by involving and educating stakeholders, the burden to be ‘right’ no longer rests on a few HQ staff and external consultants. When field staff and community knowledge informs performance management, the confidence regarding baselines, targets indicators, and data management will improve.
- GAIT II data gathering and reporting should be detailed in a concise manual or handbook, which describes in plain and clear language the procedures for collecting, reporting and storing data. Staff should be conversant with these procedures. The roles and responsibilities of staff and other stakeholders in the process should be clearly spelled out so that staff understands what is expected of them. Facilitators should have copies of the CSA field guide, which could be modified to reflect the unique GAIT II approach to governance, participation, and education. Workshops to make the procedures ‘user-friendly’ should include efforts to bridge the knowledge and working gap between the Education and DG staff both in Accra and in the field.
- Analysis of performance means that results are interpreted, anomalies explained, surprise findings discussed, and adjustments to dynamic and changing environments proposed. One

suggestion is to hold forums such as quarterly meetings between GAIT II senior staff and USAID to exchange ideas and to track progress on indicators. Roundtables on sustainability could be organized to debate what it means to score “high” and what the implications are for an exit strategy.

- Reports should be proofed carefully before releasing them. Supporting information can be placed in annexes.
- The Performance and Rating Instruments should be reviewed, simplified, and revised for clarity. Care should be taken so that the various components and actions accurately reflect the activity being measured. A workshop should be organized to this effect.
- Some methodological issues need attention. Focus group methods could be improved. Training in local languages is necessary. To ensure accuracy and to monitor results, focus group sessions should be audio-taped. Focus group data could be triangulated further with a questionnaire administered randomly to individual DA members and to civic group leaders. A fresh look should be given to determine how results from Suhum (a GAIT I district) should be tallied and reported.
- Data integrity can be enhanced when USAID performs regular spot checks in the field. A subsequent DQA should be held approximately one year from the date of this DQA.

Annex One: Scope of Work

Scope of Work for Data Quality Assessment for the Government Accountability Improves Trust II (GAIT II) Project

Background and Justification: The GAIT II project aims to support more open, competent, transparent and accountable district-level government, improved advocacy by Civic Unions (CUs) and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) for citizen interests at the district level, and improved community advocacy for and contribution to education quality. Effective local government requires a working partnership between civil society groups and the various offices and committees that comprise the District Assemblies. Horizontal linkages among District Assemblies (DAs) and CSOs across districts and within regions will be established and strengthened for the cross-fertilization of ideas, sharing of best practices, and building and voicing regional policy agendas. The program is crosscutting as it aims to build community and district level support for quality education. This will consist of activities aimed at increasing community ownership of schools and assisting parent-teacher associations (PTAs) and community-level school management committees (SMCs) to make teachers and administrators more accountable. The program will also provide support to increase community involvement and contribution to the management and oversight of education quality. In addition to capacity building activities, the program will use various citizen participation techniques to improve citizen-government relationships and quality education.

The project was launched in August 2004, and it builds on the success of the GAIT I program. The assessment conducted in November 2003 revealed that while the GAIT program was quite successful, it has some monitoring and evaluation (M&E) weaknesses that needed to be addressed. GAIT II team is made up of a consortium that includes original GAIT I implementer Cooperative League of the USA and expands to include the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) and the Education Development Corporation (EDC). EDC has brought significant M&E experience from the Community School project under the Mission's previous Education strategy.

To ensure that the project has the necessary M&E foundation, the Mission would like to conduct a data quality assessment (DQA) that would assist in the finalization of the Mission's performance monitoring plan (PMP) and would ensure that the GAIT II project has gotten off on the right foot. For this reason, the Mission would like to use staff that have worked on the GAIT I assessment and have significant prior knowledge of the GAIT I activity as an opportunity to pair them with the new Mission Local Government Specialist that is being brought on to manage this program.

Proposed Timing: Mid-February 2005 (Feb 14 – March 4, 2005)

Location: The DQA will include work in Accra as well as time in the field visiting the five current districts in which GAIT II operates in Volta, Eastern, and Northern Regions. Roughly half the time is envisioned outside of Accra.

Tasks

As part of the DQA exercise, it is expected that the following will be achieved:

1. Assess the quality of proposed indicators and make appropriate revisions if required
2. Assess the quality of baseline data and provide recommendations on how data gathering can be improved
3. Assess the quality of the targets proposed and make appropriate revisions if required
4. Review and assess quality of data gathering and reporting systems that the GAIT II project has put into place. Make recommendations on how they can be improved.
5. Determine to what extent recommendations and lessons learned from the GAIT I assessment are being implemented. Make recommendations on how to address those that are not being implemented yet.
6. Report all findings to the DG team and give the DG team analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the data
7. New Mission Local Government Specialist will be fully involved in DQA and the assessment will serve as an opportunity to deepen his understanding of the GAIT II project and receive valuable mentoring from knowledgeable DC based staff
8. Based on the DQA, review and revise the DG Team's PMP, ensuring that it has:
 - a. Set of relevant performance indicators, with baselines and targets that seem appropriate
 - b. Data source and method for data collection defined and explained
 - c. Schedule for Data collection is included
 - d. Known data limitation are identified
 - e. Terms used in indicator are defined

Annex two: list of Persons interviewed

I. SUHUM:

A. Gait II Team:

1. Albert Nyarko, M&E Specialist, Accra
2. Raymond Danso, DTA Suhum District
3. Abena Yirenkyiwa Afari, NSP and Facilitator Suhum District

B. DA:

1. Ndinga Mborinyi – (District Budget Officer)
2. Lawrence Awunyo – (District Coordination Director)
3. Elijah Acquah – (Local Government Inspector)

C. DEO

1. Mr. Simon K. Atakpa Public Relations Officer
2. Mr. Joseph Sekum Aidoo, Budget Officer
3. Fred Ofori-Mensah, Assistant Director

Suhum-Krabo-Coaltar GES Raters

1. Mr. Fred Ofori-Mensah, Assistant Director
2. Mr. Simon K. Atakpa Public Relations Officer
3. Mr. Joseph Sekum Aidoo, Budget Officer

PLA Facilitator

1. Mr. E. N. Mensah, Welfare Officer
2. Mr. Seth Awuku Etsey, Circuit Supervisor, Suhum East

D. CU

1. Esther Antwi-Adjei – Chairperson, CU
2. Idriss Ibrahim Aboati - Ag Secretary. Ayekotse Youth Development Association
3. Moses Darko – Secretary, Ghana Electronics Services Technological Association (GESTA)
4. Cynthia Adu Bofo – Treasurer CU

II. WEST GONJA

A. GAIT II TEAM

1. Cletus Kaba – DTA
2. Ibrahim Osman – CF
3. Romanus –Zonal M&E Assistant, WA
4. Wumbie Tokrugu – CF
5. Latifa Nyari – CF
6. Abdul Abubakari Karim – CF
7. Ewumtomah Malik – CF
8. Yusif Kofi Asua – CF

B. DA

1. Issifu Fawei – Deputy District Coordinating Director
2. Alhassan J. Zakaria – Assembly member for Damongo Zongo
3. Alhassan Yakubu – District Finance Officer

C. DEO**GES PLA Facilitators**

1. Seidu V. Abiba – District Girl Child Education Officer
2. Sylvia H. Seidu – Early Childhood Development Coordinator

D. CU

1. Baba Hamidu MacLean – Executive Director, Progressive Youth Association
2. Veronica Oppong – Chairperson, Hairdressers Association
3. Alice Sumani – Chairperson, Tailors/Dressmakers Association
4. Idrussi Sumani Mohammed, CU President

III. BOLE:**A. GAIT II TEAM**

1. Yahaya Yakubu – DTA
2. Alhassan Abdul Malik – CF
3. Alexander Bayon – CF
4. Dramani Hawa Joyce – CF
5. Adams Dramani Den – CF
6. Yakubu Abukari – CF
7. Fati Mahama – CF
8. Joseph Kupo – CF
9. Abu Saika – CF
10. Nasiru Suraju Deen – CF

B. DEO

1. Dep. District Director of Education
2. Assistant Director – Guidance/Counseling
3. Assistant Director – Supervision
4. Budget officer – District Education Office

C. CU

1. Fatima Mahama, Chairperson, Women's Wing, CU
2. Osman Baba Alhassan, Financial secretary CU
3. Masata Alhassan – Chairperson, Tailors/Dressmakers Association
4. Ali Amadou – Organizer Tailors/Dressmakers Association
5. Nyadia Haruna – Secretary Tailors/Dressmakers Association
6. Aworo Sarichi – Patron, Kabo Star Youth Association
7. Bakari Seidu – Secretary, Kabo Star Youth Association
8. Alhaji Abdulai Adam – Founder, Kabo Star Youth Association
9. Halidu Sumani – Member, Kabo Star Youth Association

10. Issah Zakariah – Member, Kabo Star Youth Association

IV. HO DISTRICT

A. GAIT II TEAM

1. Mawunyo Banini – DTA
2. Shine Kloanyuie Adrie –CF
3. Emmanuel Darlington Drayi – CF
4. David Komlagah Edem – CF
5. Richard Ahey – CF
6. Juliet Donkor – CF
7. Charlotte Suapim – CF
8. Victor K. Amu – CF
9. Dzifa Anku – CF

B. DA

1. Steve Okrah – District Budget Officer

C. DEO

1. Regina Kwoffie, District Coordinator, Girl Child Education

D. CU

1. Anthony Agblosu – CU Interim Chairman, Ho
2. Emmanuel Henry Ocloo – CU Interim Treasurer, Ho
3. Rev. Stephen Worlanyo Senya – CU Interim Executive Member, Ho
4. Anthony Kumaga – CU Chairman, Hohoe
5. Rosemond Kakraba – CU, Vice Chairperson and Women's Wing President, Hohoe
6. Anthony Tugli – CU Financial Secretary, Hohoe
7. Ellen Attah – Financial Secretary, Jasikan
8. Sitsofe Pi-Bansa, CU Secretary, Jasikan
9. Alhaji Braima Issaka CU, Vice Chairman, Jasikan

E. CSOs

1. Nanevi Nicholson, Chairperson, Tailors/Dressmakers Association
2. Theresa Dagbe, President, Market Women Association.

V. SOUTH TONGU DISTRICT

A. GAIT II TEAM

1. Fummey Geoffrey – DTA
2. Francis Y. K. Adaraku – CF
3. Philip Kojo Mensah – CF
4. Patience Deli Ageafa Yawa – CF
5. Nathaniel Kofi Gayari – CF
6. Agbo Korshi Steven – CF
7. Bless Adzedakor – CF
8. Fosu Dodzi – CF

B. DA

1. James Martey – District Coordinating Director
2. Ebenezer Dzukey – Dep. Dist. Coordinating Director
3. Francis Odei Asare – District Finance Officer
4. Simon Gordor – District Budget Officer
5. Samuel Kittah – District Planning Officer

C. DEO

1. Anthony Adanua – Community Participation Coordinator
2. S. K. Kattah – Logistics
3. A. K. Amenuve – GRC POII
4. W. K. Tamakloe – Peri Officer
5. Vicentia Davor – Girl Child Basic II
6. M. E Aboni – Technical and Vocational Education

D. SMC/PTA MEMBERS (Fieve Primary School)

1. H. C. Ahorli – Head teacher
2. Daniel Wormeno – PTA Chairman
3. Sampson Wormeno – SMC Chairman
4. Christine Agbesi – Unit Committee Representative on PTA

Annex Three: Indicators Workshop Participants

Pape Sene, Team Leader GAIT II
Becky Gadell, Deputy Program Leader-ICT
Bright Wereko-Brobby, Education Specialist
Albert Nyarko, M&E Coordinator
Oliver Eleeza, M&E Assistant
Reynolds Kissiedu, Education M&E Specialist
Felicia Benefo, Zonal M&E Assistant,
Yahaya Yakubu, District Technical Assistant for Bole
Geoffrey Fummey, District Technical Assistant for South Tongu
Dzifa Anku, Community Facilitator for Education in Ho
Abena Afari, Community Facilitator for the Civic Union in Suhum
Cynthia Adu Boafo, Civic Union Chairperson for Suhum
Steve Okra, District Budget Officer for Ho
Ted Lawrence, USAID DG Office
Clement Tandoh, USAID DG Office
Patrick Fosu-Siaw, USAID Program Office
Elsie Menorkpor, USAID Education Office
William Osafo, USAID Education Office
Robert Groelsema, USAID Washington DG Office

Annex Four: Indicators Issues and Proposals

GAIT II Indicators Session April 7, 2005
GAIT II Office, Accra

Objectives:

1. To reformulate GAIT II indicators
2. To revise the Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)
3. To select and revise as necessary the Performance Components Index Sheets (PCIS)

Tasks of working groups (first session):

1. Examine proposed changes to the indicators
2. Propose final wording to existing indicators and develop wording for new indicators (where applicable)

Tasks of working groups (second session):

1. Examine and revise the PIRS: definitions, unit of measure, data collection method, data sources, etc.
2. Create PIRS for new indicators
3. Select and revise the PCIS elements (i.e., actions and activities) that apply to the indicators

S0 level indicator: Number of targeted districts exceeding average performance through civic involvement and improved DA practices

Issues: "exceeding average performance" shows little change annually; indicator is double-barreled (i.e., measures two elements: "civic involvement" and "improved DA practices"; unit of measure is district instead of DA)

Proposal: change wording to "Number of targeted DAs showing improved performance annually through civic involvement"

IR5.2 #1: Number of targeted DAs exceeding average performance in participatory budgeting

Issues: "exceeding average performance" shows little change from one year to the next; time-lagged reporting (we can't show progress in Year I)

Proposal: change "exceeding average performance" to "shows improved performance annually..."

IR5.2 #2: Number of DAs exceeding local revenue projections in annual budget

Issues: "exceeding" could imply that projections are faulty (i.e., the target was underestimated); time-lagged reporting (we can't show progress in Year I)

Proposal: change "exceeding" to "meeting" (to within 5% of the projected budget)

IR5.2 #3: Number of targeted DAs exceeding average performance in citizen, involvement, accountability, networking and communication

Issues: Shows limited progress year-to-year; multiple elements--can't tell which element explains change in DA performance; time-lagged reporting

Proposal: change "exceeding average performance" to "showing improved performance annually..."; split into 4 indicators (participation, accountability, networking, and communication)

IR5.2 #4: Number of targeted DAs exceeding average performance in responsiveness to education advocacy

Issues: Duplicates indicator IR8.4 #4: Number of DEOs showing responsiveness to targeted school communities and citizen groups; shows little or no change annually

Proposal: Drop indicator IR5.2 #4 and change IR8.4 #4 to: "# of DAs showing improved responsiveness annually to targeted school communities" (DAs = DEOs, DEOCs, ED subcommittees, and AMs)

IRS .3 # 1: % o f targeted citizen groups initiating advocacy activities

Issues: baseline sample size was small so generalization is difficult; confusion over what constitutes 'advocacy' and lack of distinction between simple one-off activities and complex activities that require more time, effort, and resources; frequency of data collection, i.e.. continuous tracking vs. end-of period reporting

Proposal: Measure progress by surveying targeted citizen groups; revise PCIS to reflect a variety of advocacy activities from simple to complex; monthly data collection

IR5.3 #2: Number of targeted districts where citizen groups exceed average performance in participation, advocacy and networking

Issues: "exceeding average performance" shows little progress annually; multiple elements--can't tell which element in the indicator accounts for change; not clear which citizen groups are being counted

Proposal: change "exceeding average performance" to "showing improved performance annually..." split indicator IR5.3 #2 into three separate indicators: participation, advocacy and networking; add "citizen groups participating in GAIT II" to the wording of the indicator

IR5.3 #3: Ratio of percent of women in citizen groups' leadership positions to percent of women members

Issues: high baseline leaves little room to show improvement; indicator shows little or no change from year to year; a perverse incentive might exist to change leaders more frequently than advisable; it may not be within GAIT II control to change CSO leadership and membership

Proposal: Replace the indicator with another (women's) indicator

IR8.4 # 1: % of targeted PT As with an operational school performance improvement plan

Issues: do PT As own the SPIPs? Small sample size makes it difficult to generalize; Does ' SMC' go hand in hand with "PT A "?; Is an additional indicator necessary to track achievement of SPIP targets?

Proposal: change "PT A " to "school communities"; sample actual number of school communities if possible; data collection should be monthly; develop an additional indicator to measure progress toward achieving SPIP targets

IR8.4 #2: % of targeted PT As exceeding average performance in participation, management, networking, and financial health

Issues: "exceeding average performance" does not specify degree of change/progress annually; multiple elements-can't tell which element produces change

Proposal: change 'exceeding average performance' to 'showing improved performance annually; split indicator into four indicators: participation, management, networking and financial health

IR8.4 #3: % of targeted PTAs monitoring school performance Issues: incomplete definition on the PIRS

Proposal: Offer a more comprehensive definition of monitoring school performance on the PIRS

IR8.4 #4: (see proposed changes to IR5.2 #4)

Annex Five: List of Revised PIRS

SO5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased**Intermediate Result:** N/A**SO Level Indicator 1 (a):** Number of targeted districts showing improved local government performance through civic involvement**DESCRIPTION**

Precise Definition(s): Targeted districts are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 districts selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboaa-Coaltar and West Gonja. Local government is defined as a body with political and administrative functions over a defined area. Local government includes decentralized departments, such as the District Education Office (DEO), that play key roles in planning and delivering local services. Civic involvement occurs when citizen groups advance advocacy issues to influence and support local decisions, policies and initiatives that affect people's lives. A district is said to show improved performance when it advances from its current performance level to a higher performance level in involving citizens and other partners in decisions, development planning, mobilization of resources and service delivery. Over the life of the activity, each targeted district is expected to achieve an absolute performance level of high performance or better. District performance is measured through 22 performance components organized in four indices: District Assembly (DA) Performance Index (9 components); Citizen Groups Performance Index (5 components); District Education Office Performance Index (2 components); School Management Committee/Parent Teacher Association (SMC/PTAs) Index (6 components). For this indicator, the DA (9 components) and DEO (2 components) performance indices are grouped together (11 total components) to capture local government while the citizen group (5 components) and SMC/PTAs (6 components) performances indices are grouped together (11 total components) to capture level of civic involvement. See Annex 1 for details on all 4 indices and their components.

Unit of Measure: Targeted districts**Disaggregated by:** Targeted districts; performance levels of Local Government (DA/DEO), and Civil Society Organizations (Citizens groups/SMC/PTAs)

Justification/Management Utility: This indicator captures the 22 separate components that are the basis for the DA, citizen groups, DEO and SMC/PTAs performance indices. Each of the 22 components measures elements of local government performance and is grouped separately in various intermediate result level indicators under IRs 5.2, 5.3, and 8.4. USAID/Ghana defines good local government performance as being dependent on civic input explicitly captured in indices tracking engagement with citizens, as well as specifically with SMC/PTAs, and as requiring interaction between decentralized local departments and the DA. The definition assumes local government will only be truly effective when it involves the engagement and working together between all bodies at the district level, captured in the DEO and DA indices. For purposes of performance measurement, and in the context of this indicator, the local government body is made up of the DA and DEO (both of which make up 11 or 50% of the total 22 components). In the same vein, civil society composes of citizens groups and SMCs/PTAs (making up 11 or 50% of the 22 total performance components). The emphasis on the interaction between DAs and DEOs underscores the SO's focus on decentralization as critical to improved democratic local governance. Finally, this indicator captures the true cross-cutting nature of the Democracy & Governance program as it includes critical elements of Education IR8.4 referenced above by singling out SMC/PTAs and DEOs as bodies on which the program is focusing and where the lead DG activity is working to achieve results. Therefore, because USAID/Ghana defines improved local governance performance as dependent on improved performance of DAs, citizens, SMC/PTAs, and DEOs, this indicator captures perfectly all the nuances of local government performance.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

<p>Data Collection Methods: On an annual basis (July), data gatherers, both external and internal raters, will: 1. at the district level conduct structured interviews and focus groups of district officials and citizen groups by using questionnaires associated with the DA, Citizen Groups, DEO, and SMC/PTAs Performance Indices; and 2. in school communities, use the Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) approach to elicit responses from various target groups, especially SMC/PTAs. On at periodic basis, GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs) and community facilitators gather and submit data on DA, DEO, citizen groups and SMC/PTAs activities.</p> <p>Data Sources: 1. Officials and representatives of DAs, citizen groups, DEOs, and SMC/PTAs; 2. Public records of the DA and DEO; 3. Records of local citizen groups' and SMC/PTAs</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports</p> <p>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year (July) by external raters.</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget</p> <p>Individual Responsible at USAID: Local Government Specialist</p> <p>Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: GAIT II M&E system; USAID/Ghana DG Office (M & E filing cabinet)</p>			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): 1. Qualitative data subject to any instrument limitations using focus groups; 2. DA and citizen groups' records may be inadequate or non-existent; and 3. Record access could be limited</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: 1. Consensus ratings during rater debriefing sessions, follow-on inter-rater reliability checks, variability checks among ratings, refresher training for all players in data collection. 2. Memoranda of Understanding and ongoing technical cooperation between GAIT II and targeted DAs and citizen groups.</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID</p>			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING			
<p>Data Analysis: Targeted districts' performance levels are determined by computing a cumulative score of all 22 performance components. Five classes of scores are defined: <i>Outstanding</i> – 99 - 110; <i>High</i> – 77 - 98; <i>Average</i> – 55 - 76; <i>Low</i> – 33 - 54, and <i>Weak</i> – 22 - 32. When converted to a percentage scale they are: <i>Outstanding</i> (80-100); <i>High</i> (61-80); <i>Average</i> (41-60); <i>Low</i> (21-40), and <i>Weak</i> (0-20). In consultation with field staff and local partners, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes the program leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables, charts and graphs</p> <p>Review of Data: By USAID D&G SO Team during semi-annual annual portfolio review (SAPR); annual review</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15</p>			
OTHER NOTES			
<p>1. GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboah-Coaltar and West Gonja.</p> <p>2. For this indicator, Cohort 1 will be used for the first three years of reporting.</p>			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		N/A	Indicator measures change in Cohort 1
2005	2		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	3		
2007	3		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			
<i>This sheet was last updated: May 5, 2005</i>			

SO5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased**Intermediate Result:** N/A**SO Level Indicator 1(b):** Number of targeted districts achieving high performance in local government through civic involvement**DESCRIPTION**

Precise Definition(s): Targeted districts are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 districts selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboaa-Coaltar and West Gonja. Local government is defined as a body with political and administrative functions over a defined area. Local government includes decentralized departments, such as the District Education Office (DEO), that play key roles in planning and delivering local services. Civic involvement occurs when citizen groups advance advocacy issues to influence and support local decisions, policies and initiatives that affect people's lives. A district is said to achieve "high" performance when it scores at least a combined 61 on a zero to 100 scale on the aggregated indices. District performance is measured through 22 performance components organized in four indices: District Assembly (DA) Performance Index (9 components); Citizen Groups Performance Index (5 components); District Education Office Performance Index (2 components); School Management Committee/Parent Teacher Association (SMC/PTAs) Index (6 components). For this indicator, the DA (9 components) and DEO (2 components) performance indices are grouped together (11 total components) to capture local government and count for 50% of the score while the citizen group (5 components) and SMC/PTAs (6 components) performances indices are grouped together (11 total components) to capture level of civic involvement and count 50% of the score. These indices together measure the involvement of citizens and other partners in decisions, development planning, mobilization of resources and service delivery. See Annex 1 for details on all 4 indices and their components.

Unit of Measure: Targeted districts**Disaggregated by:** Targeted districts; performance levels of Local government (made up of DA/DEO) and Civil Society (comprising Citizens groups/SMC/PTA)

Justification/Management Utility: This indicator captures the 22 separate components that are the basis for the DA, citizen groups, DEO and SMC/PTAs performance indices. It endeavors to measure the performance of the districts in attaining the ultimate goal of the project (achieving high performance). Each of the 22 components measures elements of local government performance and is grouped separately in various intermediate result level indicators under IRs 5.2, 5.3, and 8.4. USAID/Ghana defines good local government performance as being dependent on civic input explicitly captured in indices tracking engagement with citizens, as well as specifically with SMC/PTAs, and as requiring interaction between decentralized local departments and the DA. The definition assumes local government will only be truly effective when it involves the engagement and working together between all bodies at the district level, captured in the DEO and DA indices. The emphasis on the interaction between DAs and DEOs underscores the SO's focus on decentralization as critical to improved democratic local governance. Finally, this indicator captures the true cross-cutting nature of the Democracy & Governance program as it includes critical elements of Education IR8.4 referenced above by singling out SMC/PTAs and DEOs as bodies on which the program is focusing and where the lead DG activity is working to achieve results. Therefore, because USAID/Ghana defines improved local governance performance as dependent on improved performance of DAs, citizens, SMC/PTAs, and DEOs, this indicator captures perfectly all the nuances of local government performance.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

<p>Data Collection Methods: Data Collection Methods: On an annual basis (July), data gathers, both external and internal raters, will: 1. at the district level conduct structured interviews and focus groups of district officials and citizen groups by using questionnaires associated with the DA, Citizen Groups, DEO, and SMC/PTAs Performance Indices; and 2. in school communities, use the Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) approach to elicit responses from various target groups, especially SMC/PTAs. On at periodic basis, GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs) and community facilitators gather and submit data on DA, DEO, citizen groups and SMC/PTAs activities.</p> <p>Data Sources: 1. Officials and representatives of DAs, citizen groups, DEOs, and SMC/PTAs; 2. Public records of the DA and DEO; 3. Records of local citizen groups' and SMC/PTAs</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports</p> <p>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year by external raters.</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget</p> <p>Individual Responsible at USAID: Local Government Specialist</p> <p>Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: GAIT II M&E system; USAID/Ghana DG Office (M&E filing cabinet)</p>			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): 1. Qualitative data subject to any instrument limitations using focus groups; rater subjectivity. 2. DA and citizen groups' records may be inadequate or non-existent; 3. Record access could be limited</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: 1. Consensus ratings during rater debriefing sessions, follow-on inter-rater reliability checks, variability checks among ratings, refresher training for all players in data collection. 2. Memoranda of Understanding and ongoing technical cooperation between GAIT II and targeted DAs and citizen groups.</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID</p>			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING			
<p>Data Analysis: Targeted districts' performance levels are determined by computing a cumulative score of all 22 performance components. Five classes of scores are defined: <i>Outstanding</i> – 99 - 110; <i>High</i> – 77 - 98; <i>Average</i> – 55 - 76; <i>Low</i> – 33 - 54, and <i>Weak</i> – 22 - 32. When converted to a percentage scale they are: <i>Outstanding</i> (80-100); <i>High</i> (61-80); <i>Average</i> (41-60); <i>Low</i> (21-40), and <i>Weak</i> (0-20). In consultation with field staff and local partners, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes the program leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables, charts and graphs</p> <p>Review of Data: By USAID D&G SO Team during semi-annual annual portfolio review (SAPR); annual review</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15</p>			
OTHER NOTES			
<p>1. GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboah-Coaltar and West Gonja.</p> <p>2. For this indicator, Cohort 1 will be used for the first three years of reporting.</p>			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		0	Indicator measures change in Cohort 1
2005	1		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	2		
2007	3		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			
<i>This sheet was last updated: May 5, 2005</i>			

This page intentionally left blank.

IR 5.2Indicator

SO5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased IR 5.2 Indicator

Intermediate Result 5.2: Strengthened district assembly capacity for democratic governance

Indicator 1: Number of targeted district assemblies showing high performance in participatory budget process

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Targeted district assemblies (DAs) are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 DAs selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. A DA is defined as the local government body with political and administrative functions over a locally defined area. The DA includes decentralized departments, such as the District Education Office, that play key roles planning and delivering local services. A DA is said to show high performance when it achieves level four on a five-level performance scale in DA Performance Component 8, Participatory Budget Process. Performance scale levels are *Outstanding*, *High*, *Average*, *Low* and *Weak*. A high performing DA joins citizens and DA's in all phases of budget preparation, approval and implementation to:

- Agree on budget preparation schedule, policies and process; document agreement in minutes and resolution(s).
- Set budget priorities for service levels, special initiatives and capital improvements.
- Determine reasonable rates and fees. Identify other revenue sources. Set annual revenue targets.
- Review draft budget in public discussions, including formal hearing(s), before the assembly's final, public approval.
- Monitor budget performance, including review of any necessary revisions.

Units of Measure: Targeted DAs

Disaggregated by: Targeted Districts performance levels in "Participatory Budget Process"

Justification/Management Utility: A local participatory budget process considers the unique needs, resources and priorities of citizens of the district. GAIT II considers the local budget process a concrete opportunity to bring citizens and local government together to determine, fund and act on local service and infrastructure priorities. While the national legal framework provides local budget process standards, including the requirement for citizen involvement, it leaves the *how* to DAs. No targeted DA has institutionalized a participatory budget process; some inform citizens of budget decisions after-the-fact and, at best, involve citizens in setting local rates and fees. With GAIT II assistance, targeted DAs will use DA Performance Component 8 to steer, assess and monitor progress in this key area.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Methods: On a periodic basis, record gathering and review by GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs) working with community facilitators, citizen groups and DA officials; 2. On an annual basis (July), structured interviews and focus groups of DA officials and citizen groups by data gatherers, both external and internal raters, using DA Performance Component 8

Data Sources: 1. DA officials and representatives of citizen groups; 2. DA records, including assembly minutes, resolutions and budget documents; 3. Local citizen groups' records

Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year by external raters.

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget

Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist

Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader

Location of Data Storage: GAIT II M&E system; USAID/Ghana DG Office (M&E filing cabinet)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): 1. Because the District's financial year does not follow the USAID reporting cycle, this is a partially lagged indicator. As a result, while some data will be drawn from the current reporting year, others can only be sourced from the prior year 2. Potential reluctance of DA officials to make records readily available; 3. Citizen groups' records may be inadequate

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Data analysis will acknowledge what can be drawn from current year's performance and what is drawn from the prior year's performance. Memoranda of Understanding and ongoing technical cooperation and communication between GAIT II and local DA and citizen group partners to improve data availability.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Performance scale levels are *Outstanding* (5); *High* (4); *Average* (3) *Low* (2), and, *Weak* (1). GAIT II M&E Unit computes average score from consensus ratings in referenced performance components. In consultation with DA and citizen group partners, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes project team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies.

Presentation of Data: Tabular presentation; illustrative charts or graphs, as needed

Review of Data: Annual by USAID/Ghana DG SO team and by GAIT II with DA officials and citizen groups in target DAs

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15

OTHER NOTES

1. GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboah-Coaltar and West Gonja.

2. For this indicator, Cohort 1 will be used for the first three years of reporting.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		0	Indicator tracks progress in Cohort 1
2005	1		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	2		
2007	3		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			

This sheet was last updated May 5, 2005

SO5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased IR 5.2 Indicator

Intermediate Result 5.2: Strengthened District Assembly Capacity for Democratic Governance

Indicator 2: Number of targeted district assemblies meeting local revenue projections in annual budget

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Targeted district assemblies (DAs) are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 DAs selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. A DA is defined as the local government body with political and administrative functions over a locally defined area. The DA includes decentralized departments, such as the District Education Office, that play key roles planning and delivering local services. Local revenue refers to the internally generated funds realized within the district under seven major revenue heads: rates, lands, fees & fines, licenses, rent, investment and miscellaneous. Projections are defined as the revenue targets documented in the DA final budget as approved by assembly members. A DA is said to meet local revenue projections when the actual revenue reported in the DA final accounts comes within 5% of, or exceeds budgetary targets for the fiscal year. The Ghana government fiscal year extends from January 1 to December 31.

Units of Measure: DA annual budget local revenue projections for fiscal year (produced by November 30); actual revenue for prior fiscal year as expressed in the Annual Statement of Accounts (produced by March 31).

Disaggregated by: Targeted DAs; seven major revenue heads of targeted DAs' internally generated fund (IGF)

Justification/Management Utility: DA service and infrastructure improvements require improved local revenue mobilization to complement national allocations from the DA Common Fund (DACF). DACF has been woefully inadequate for DAs to meet the service delivery capacity required to improve the lives of local citizenry. The need for DAs to increase their internally generated revenues to supplement the DACF becomes very crucial. Local revenues can substantially be improved when DAs involve citizens (ratepayers) in setting and collecting local rates and fees. GAIT II views local revenue projection as a clear measure and entry point for improved DA performance in finance and budget management, ethics and accountability, revenue mobilization and citizen involvement. Over the project life, GAIT II will seek to improve DAs capacity to project local revenue accurately and realistically, and also adopt effective strategies to meet projected revenues annually

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: Manual review and comparison of local revenue projections with DA final accounts by GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs), local government and M&E staff working with finance and budget officers in targeted DAs

Data Sources: DA records, including budget (as approved by district assembly) and DA final accounts for corresponding fiscal year

Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year by external raters.

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget

Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist

Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader

Location of Data Storage: GAIT II M&E system; USAID/Ghana DG Office (M&E filing cabinet)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): 1. This is a lag indicator because the District's financial year does not follow the USAID reporting cycle. The reports will be obtained from data on the District's level of revenue collection performance from the previous year. This data will be available for the semi-annual report in April. 2. Potential reluctance of DA officials to make records readily available 3. DA may set low targets to meet government/donor fiscal obligations.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: 1. Targets assume one-year lag in reporting of budget revenue projections and annual statement of accounts. 2. To support ready access to DA financial information, GAIT II has Memoranda of Understanding, ongoing technical cooperation and communication with targeted DAs and citizen groups

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: In consultation with local government and citizen group partners in targeted DAs, data is analyzed and summarized by the GAIT II core technical team, including the team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators and a representative of the Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies

Presentation of Data: Tabular presentation showing revenue projections against actual revenue; charts or graphs, as needed

Review of Data: Annual data reviews by USAID/Ghana Democracy and Governance SO team and by GAIT II with DA and representatives of citizen groups in target DAs

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15

OTHER NOTES

1. GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja.

2. For this indicator, Cohort 1 will be used for the first three years of reporting.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		2	
2005	N/A	N/A	This is a lag indicator, no data
2006	3		
2007	4		
2008	4		Last year for Cohort 1
2009			

This sheet was last updated May 5, 2005

SO5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased IR 5.2 Indicator

Intermediate Result 5.2: Strengthened District Assembly Capacity for Democratic Governance

Indicator 3(a): Number of targeted district assemblies showing improved performance on the District Assembly Performance Index (DAPI).

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Targeted district assemblies (DAs) are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 DAs selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. A DA is defined as the local government body with political and administrative functions over a locally defined area. The DA includes decentralized departments, such as the District Education Office, that play key roles planning and delivering local services. A DA is said to improve performance when it advances from its current performance level to a higher one on a five-level scale. Performance scale levels are 1. *Weak*; 2. *Low*; 3. *Average*; 4. *High*; 5. *Outstanding*. Over project life, GAIT II expects targeted DAs to advance to a level of *high* or better. Index Levels are determined based on ratings achieved in nine DA Performance Index components:

1. Participatory decision-making
2. Citizens involvement in development planning
3. Networking and coalition building
4. Ethics and accountability
5. Resource mobilization
6. Communication
7. Public-private partnerships
8. Participatory budgeting
9. Responsiveness to education sector

Unit of Measure: Targeted DAs

Disaggregated by: Targeted DAs' performance levels in 9 components identified above.

Justification/Management Utility: GAIT II assumes democratic governance grows strongest from the base, in communities where people live. The GAIT II project has included 9 components in the DA performance index to capture all aspects of performance, including engagement with citizens' groups, SMC/PTAs and DEOs. While the national framework spells out standards in the referenced performance areas, DAs have just begun to put these standards into practice. Progress in health, education, human rights and economic development largely depend on the capacity of DAs to engage citizens in selecting and working together to address local priorities. With GAIT II assistance, targeted DAs will use this DA Performance Component to steer, assess and monitor progress in these key areas.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: On an annual basis (July), data gathers, both external and internal raters, will conduct structured interviews and focus groups of district officials and citizen groups by using questionnaires associated with the DA, Performance Index, components 1-9. On a periodic basis, GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs) with community facilitators, citizen groups and DA officials gather and submit data on DA activities.

Data Sources: 1. Representatives of targeted DAs and citizen groups; 2. DA records 3. Local citizen groups' records

Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year by external raters.

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget

Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist

Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader

Location of Data Storage: GAIT II M&E system; USAID/Ghana DG Office (M&E filing cabinet)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Records may not exist in some districts and access to DA records could be limited by issues outside implementing partner's control; citizen groups' records may be inadequate; Qualitative data subject to any limitations using focus groups.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Memoranda of Understanding and ongoing technical cooperation and communication between GAIT II and targeted DA and citizen groups

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: GAIT II M&E Unit computes average score from consensus ratings in referenced nine performance components. Targeted districts' performance is determined by computing the cumulative score of all 9 components. Performance scale levels are: *Outstanding* (41-45); *High* (32-40); *Average* (23-31) *Low* (14-22) and *Weak* (9-13). When converted to a percentage scale, they are: *Outstanding* (81-100); *High* (61-80); *Average* (41-60) *Low* (21-40) and *Weak* (0-20). In consultation with DA and citizen group partners, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies.

Presentation of Data: Tabular presentation; illustrative charts or graphs, as needed

Review of Data: Annual by USAID/Ghana DG SO team and by GAIT II with DA officials and citizen groups in targeted DAs

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by July 31

OTHER NOTES

1. GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboah-Coaltar and West Gonja.

2. For this indicator, Cohort 1 will be used for the first three years of reporting.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		N/A	Indicator measure change in Cohort 1
2005	3		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	2		
2007	3		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			

This sheet was last updated May 5, 2005

SO5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased IR 5.2 Indicator	
Intermediate Result 5.2: Strengthened District Assembly Capacity for Democratic Governance Indicator 3(b): Number of targeted district assemblies achieving high performance on the District Assembly Performance Index (DAPI).	
DESCRIPTION	
<p>Precise Definition(s): Targeted district assemblies (DAs) are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 DAs selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. A DA is defined as the local government body with political and administrative functions over a locally defined area. The DA includes decentralized departments, such as the District Education Office, that play key roles planning and delivering local services. A DA is said to show high performance when it achieves level four on a five-level performance scale in the DA Performance index. Performance levels are: 1. <i>Weak</i>; 2. <i>Low</i>; 3. <i>Average</i>; 4. <i>High</i>; 5. <i>Outstanding</i>. Index levels are based on ratings in nine DA performance components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participatory decision-making 2. Citizens involvement in development planning 3. Networking and coalition building 4. Ethics and accountability 5. Resource mobilization and dynamism 6. Communication 7. Public-private partnerships 8. Participatory budgeting 9. Responsiveness to education sector <p>Unit of Measure: Targeted DAs</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Targeted DAs' performance levels in Citizen Involvement; Ethics and Accountability; Communication; and, Networking and Coalition Building</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: GAIT II assumes democratic governance grows strongest from the base, in communities where people live. The GAIT II project has included 9 components in the DA performance index to capture all aspects of performance, including engagement with citizens' groups, SMCs/PTAs and DEOs. While the national framework spells out standards in the referenced performance areas, DAs have just begun to put these standards into practice. Progress in health, education, human rights and economic development largely depend on the capacity of DAs to engage citizens in selecting and working together to address local priorities. With GAIT II assistance, targeted DAs will use this DA Performance Component to steer, assess and monitor progress in these key areas.</p>	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID	
<p>Data Collection Method: On an annual basis (July), data gathers, both external and internal raters, will conduct structured interviews and focus groups of district officials and citizen groups by using questionnaires associated with the DA, Performance Index, components 1-9. On a periodic basis, GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs) with community facilitators, citizen groups and DA officials gather and submit data on DA activities.</p> <p>Data Sources: 1. Representatives of targeted DAs and citizen groups; 2. DA records 3. Local citizen groups' records</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports</p> <p>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year by external raters.</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget</p> <p>Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist</p> <p>Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: GAIT II M&E system; USAID/Ghana DG Office (M&E filing cabinet)</p>	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Records may not exist in some districts and access to DA records could be limited by issues outside implementing partner's control; citizen groups' records may be inadequate; Qualitative data subject to any instrument limitations using focus groups.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Memoranda of Understanding and ongoing technical cooperation and communication between GAIT II and targeted DA and citizen groups

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: GAIT II M&E Unit computes average score from consensus ratings in referenced nine performance components. Targeted districts' performance is determined by computing the cumulative score of all 9 components. Performance scale levels are: *Outstanding* (41-45); *High* (32-40); *Average* (23-31) *Low* (14-22) and *Weak* (9-13). When converted to a percentage scale, they are: *Outstanding* (81-100); *High* (61-80); *Average* (41-60) *Low* (21-40) and *Weak* (0-20). In consultation with DA and citizen group partners, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies.

Presentation of Data: Tabular presentation; illustrative charts or graphs, as needed

Review of Data: Annual by USAID/Ghana DG SO team and by GAIT II with DA officials and citizen groups in targeted DAs

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15

OTHER NOTES

1. GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja.

2. For this indicator, Cohort 1 will be used for the first three years of reporting.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		0	Indicator tracks change in performance level of Cohort 1
2005	1		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	1		
2007	3		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			

This sheet was last updated May 5, 2005

IR 5.3 Indicators

O5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased
R 5.3 Indicator

Intermediate Result 5.3: Improved Sectoral Advocacy Performance

Indicator 1 (a): Number of advocacy activities successfully undertaken by targeted citizen groups (Level 1 only).

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Targeted citizen groups include civil society organizations (CSOs), civic unions (CUs), and School Management Committee/Parent Teacher Associations (SMC/PTAs) in targeted districts. Targeted districts are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 districts selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. Advocacy activity is defined as any civic action designed to change or influence public activities, projects, programs or policies affecting the local community. An advocacy activity is considered to be successfully undertaken if the goal of initiating such an activity has fully been achieved. Advocacy is measured at three levels of increasing complexity. The levels are:

Level 1: Quick win, easy to achieve; local issue or impact; requires less than six months duration; one audience. Examples: Demands to district officials for installation of speed ramps, dustbins or streetlights.

Level 2: Local issue, but of greater difficulty; requires follow-up for at least six months, more human and financial resources than level one activities, partnering with another CSO or dealing with more than one audience. Examples: Advocating to the DA and seeking legal advice to manage a community center; advocating to the District Chief Executive and to Member of Parliament (MP) to obtain a seat on the District Assembly (DA).

Level 3: Regional- or national-level issue; requires the formation of a regional or national coalition or network; involves multiple audiences; has broad impact. Examples: Domestic violence legislation, national health insurance legislation, internal revenue stamp tax involving multiple agencies and multiple levels of government, such as DA executives and MPs.

Unit of Measure: Advocacy activities

Disaggregated by: 1. Sector: (a) education, (b) health, (c) economic growth (enterprise development, business environment), (d) environment/agriculture, (e) road/transport, (f) sanitation & water, and (g) other); 2. Gender impact; 3. Citizen group; 4. Targeted districts

Justification/Management Utility: This indicator focuses on level 1 because this is the level at which citizens groups begin advocacy efforts as these involve the least complex issues and also the easiest to show results. This indicator is particularly useful in the first two years of the project. It will give information on the level of engagement and follow through of the targeted citizens groups. By the second year, it is anticipated that citizen groups will become more developed and begin to focus on level 2 and above advocacy activities. Although the indicator measures number of advocacy initiatives and not effectiveness of the advocacy process, it is relevant to the Ghanaian context where civic action has not been encouraged.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: Monthly tracking by field staff through interviews of citizen group leaders and key informants; review of citizen group and DA records; reports from GAIT II Community Facilitators (CFs), District Technical Assistants (DTAs), and zonal offices

Data Source(s): Documented records from citizen groups and DAs

Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year (July) by external raters.

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget

Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist

Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader

Location of Data Storage: GAIT II M&E system; USAID/Ghana DG Office (M&E filing cabinet)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Citizen groups' and DAs' record keeping and documentation systems may be inadequate; difficulty in distinguishing between the 3 levels of advocacy activities, particularly levels 1 & 2; determining the levels of advocacy activities may be subjective and open to interpretations

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Assistance in development of record keeping and documentation systems within citizen groups and their networks; Memoranda of Understanding and ongoing technical cooperation and communication with citizen groups and DA; refresher training for GAIT II staff and other stakeholders on the levels of advocacy coupled with efforts to define the levels better.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checking of data and further reliability checks by USAID.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: After data collection, M&E Coordinator & Team Leader analyze data, disaggregate advocacy activities by complexity, sector (or type of issue); gender, and district. In consultation with DA and citizen group partners, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes program team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies

Presentation of Data: Tabular presentation; illustrative charts or graphs, as needed

Review of Data: Annual by USAID/Ghana DG SO team and by GAIT II with citizen groups and DA officials in targeted districts

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15

OTHER NOTES

. GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboabooltar and West Gonja.

. For this indicator, Cohort 1 will be used for the first three years of reporting.

. For the baseline, this indicator drew its data from 24 citizens groups. As the project progresses, it is assumed that the number of citizen groups involved in cohort 1 will expand.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)	Baseline (2004)	2	Based on sample of 24 citizen groups only,
2005	5		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	15		
2007	30		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			

This sheet was last updated: May 5, 2005

IR 5.3 Indicators

GO5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased
R 5.3 Indicator

Intermediate Result 5.3: Improved Sectoral Advocacy Performance

Indicator 1 (b): Number of advocacy activities successfully undertaken by targeted citizen groups (Level 2 and above only).

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Targeted citizen groups include civil society organizations (CSOs), civic unions (CUs), and School Management Committee/Parent Teacher Associations (SMC/PTAs) in targeted districts. Targeted districts are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 districts selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. Advocacy activity is defined as any civic action designed to change or influence public activities, projects, programs or policies affecting the local community. An advocacy activity is considered to be successfully undertaken if the goal of initiating such an activity has fully been achieved. Advocacy is measured at three levels of increasing complexity. The levels are:

Level 1: Quick win, easy to achieve; local issue or impact; requires less than six months duration; one audience. Examples: Demands to district officials for installation of speed ramps, dustbins or streetlights.

Level 2: Local issue, but of greater difficulty; requires follow-up for at least six months, more human and financial resources than level one activities, partnering with another CSO or dealing with more than one audience. Examples: Advocating to the DA and seeking legal advice to manage a community center; advocating to the District Chief Executive and to Member of Parliament (MP) to obtain a seat on the District Assembly (DA).

Level 3: Regional- or national-level issue; requires the formation of a regional or national coalition or network; involves multiple audiences; has broad impact. Examples: Domestic violence legislation, national health insurance legislation, internal revenue stamp tax involving multiple agencies and multiple levels of government, such as DA executives and MPs.

Unit of Measure: Advocacy activities

Disaggregated by: 1. Complexity; 2. Sector: (a) education, (b) health, (c) economic growth (enterprise development, business environment), (d) environment/agriculture, (e) road/transport, (f) sanitation & water, and (g) other); 3. Gender impact; 4. Citizen group; 5. Targeted district

Justification/Management Utility: This indicator focuses on level 2 and above advocacy activities. It is this level of advocacy engagement which citizens groups aspire to attain. The indicator becomes more useful in year 2 and beyond as citizens groups become more sophisticated. Although the indicator measures number of advocacy initiatives and not effectiveness of the advocacy process, it is relevant to the Ghanaian context where civic action has not been encouraged.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: Monthly tracking by field staff through interviews of citizen group leaders and key informants; review of citizen group and DA records; reports from GAIT II Community Facilitators (CFs), District Technical Assistants (DTAs), and zonal offices

Data Source(s): Documented records from citizen groups and DAs

Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year (July) by external raters.

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget

Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist

Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader

Location of Data Storage: GAIT II M&E system; USAID/Ghana DG Office (M&E filing cabinet)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Citizen groups' and DAs' record keeping and documentation systems may be inadequate; difficulty in distinguishing between the 3 levels of advocacy, particularly levels 1 and 2; determining the levels of advocacy activities may be subjective and open to interpretations

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Assistance in development of record keeping and documentation systems within citizen groups and their networks; Memoranda of Understanding and ongoing technical cooperation and communication with citizen groups and DA; refresher training for GAIT II staff and other stakeholders on the levels of advocacy coupled with efforts to define the levels better..

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: After data collection, M&E Coordinator & Team Leader analyze data, disaggregate advocacy activities by complexity, sector (or type of issue); gender, and district. In consultation with DA and citizen group partners, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes program team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies

Presentation of Data: Tabular presentation; illustrative charts or graphs, as needed

Review of Data: Annual by USAID/Ghana DG SO team and by GAIT II with citizen groups and DA officials in targeted districts

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15

OTHER NOTES

. GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboaloaltar and West Gonja.

. For this indicator, Cohort 1 will be used for the first three years of reporting.

. For the baseline, this indicator drew its data from 24 citizens groups. As the project progresses, it is assumed that the number of citizen groups involved in cohort 1 will expand.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		0	Indicator measures change in Cohort 1
2005	0		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	1		
2007	2		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			

This sheet was last updated: May 5, 2005

05: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased

Intermediate Result 5.3: Improved Sectoral Advocacy Performance

Indicator 2(a): Number of targeted districts where citizen groups show improved performance on the Citizen Group Performance Index (CGPI).

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Targeted districts are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 districts selected at program start-up: Bole, Bo, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. Citizen groups include civil society organizations (CSOs), civic unions (CUs), and School Management Committee/Parent Teacher Associations (SMC/PTAs) in targeted districts. Improved performance means advancing from the current performance level to a higher level of performance. Over the life of the activity, each targeted district is expected to achieve an absolute performance level of *high* or better. Levels ranging from weak to low, average, high or outstanding are determined using Citizen Group Performance Index comprised of five categories: 1. participatory management and governance; 2. effective advocacy; 3. networking and coalition building; 4. participation in local government; and, 5. resource mobilization.

Unit of Measure: Targeted districts

Disaggregated by: Targeted Districts; Citizen groups' performance in participatory management and governance; effective advocacy; networking and coalition building; participation in local government; and, resource mobilization

Justification/Management Utility: GAIT II has developed the 5 components for this index so that they capture all aspects of functional citizen groups. Citizen groups mastering the behaviors and practices contained in the five components are more likely to be able to influence local decisions and policies, and to sustain their civic activities, beyond the life of the GAIT II activity. Building the capacity of citizen groups to advocate effectively on policy issues is critical to democratic local governance and empowering people.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: On an annual basis (July), data gatherers, both external and internal raters, will conduct structured interviews and focus groups of district officials and citizen groups by using questionnaires associated with the Citizen Group Performance Index, components 1-5. On a periodic basis, GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs) with community facilitators, and citizen groups will gather and submit data on citizen group activities

Data Sources: 1. Representatives of citizen groups in targeted districts; 2. Records of citizen groups, DTAs and community facilitators

Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year (July) by external raters.

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget

Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist

Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Clarity of stages of development scenarios and component elements; use of internal staff instead of external data gatherers at the semi-annual mark; qualitative data subject to any instrument limitations using focus groups

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Refresher training, debriefing of data gatherers, further refinement/clarity of scenarios and components/elements; variability checks between external (consensus ratings) and internal

data gatherers, refresher training and debriefing for both external and internal data gatherers

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Targeted districts' performance is determined by computing a cumulative score of all 5 components. Performance scale levels are: *Outstanding* (23-25); *High* (18-22); *Average* (13-17) *Low* (8-12) and *Weak* (5-7).

When converted to a percentage scale, they are: *Outstanding* (81-100); *High* (61-80); *Average* (41-60) *Low* (21-40) and *Weak* (0-20). In consultation with citizen groups, DTAs and community facilitators, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes program team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies

Presentation of Data: Tabular, illustrative charts and graphs as needed

Review of Data: Annual by USAID/Ghana DG SO team and by GAIT II with citizen groups in targeted districts

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15

OTHER NOTES

GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboaloaltar and West Gonja.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		N/A	Indicator measures change in Cohort 1
2005	2		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	3		
2007	3		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			

This sheet was last updated: May 5, 2005

O5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased

Intermediate Result 5.3: Improved Sectoral Advocacy Performance

Indicator 2(b): Number of targeted districts where citizen groups achieve high performance on the Citizen Group Performance Index (CGPI).

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Targeted districts are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 districts selected at program start-up: Bole, Bo, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. Citizen groups include civil society organizations (CSOs), civic unions (CUs), and School Management Committee/Parent Teacher Associations (SMC/PTAs) in targeted districts. A district achieves high performance when its cumulative score is at least 61 on a zero to 100 scale. Levels ranging from weak to low, average, high or outstanding are determined using Citizen Group Performance Index comprised of five categories: 1. participatory management and governance; 2. effective advocacy; 3. networking and coalition building; 4. participation in local government; and, 5. resource mobilization.

Unit of Measure: Targeted districts

Disaggregated by: Targeted districts; Citizen groups' performance in participatory management and governance; effective advocacy; networking and coalition building; participation in local government; and, resource mobilization

Justification/Management Utility: GAIT II has developed the 5 components for this index so that they capture all aspects of what is necessary to have functional citizen groups. Citizen groups mastering the behaviors and practices contained in the five components are more likely to be able to influence local decisions and policies, and to sustain their civic activities, beyond the life of the GAIT II activity. Building the capacity of citizen groups to advocate effectively on policy issues is critical to democratic local governance and empowering people.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: On an annual basis (July), data gathers, both external and internal raters, will conduct structured interviews and focus groups of district officials and citizen groups by using questionnaires associated with the Citizen Group Performance Index, components 1-5. On a periodic basis, GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs) with community facilitators, and citizen groups will gather and submit data on citizen group activities

Data Sources: 1. Representatives of citizen groups in targeted districts; 2. Records of citizen groups, DTAs and community facilitators

Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year (July) by external raters

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget

Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist

Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Clarity of stages of development scenarios and component elements; use of internal staff instead of external raters at the semi-annual mark; qualitative data subject to any instrument limitations using focus groups

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Refresher training, debriefing of data gathers, further refinement/clarity of scenarios and components/elements; variability checks between external (consensus ratings) and internal data gatherers ratings, refresh training and debriefing for both external and internal data gatherers

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Targeted districts' performance is determined by computing a cumulative score of all 5 components. Performance scale levels are: *Outstanding* (23-25); *High* (18-22); *Average* (13-17) *Low* (8-12) and *Weak* (5-7). When converted to a percentage scale, they are: *Outstanding* (81-100); *High* (61-80); *Average* (41-60) *Low* (21-40) and *Weak* (0-20). In consultation with citizen groups, DTAs and community facilitators, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes program team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies

Presentation of Data: Tabular, illustrative charts and graphs as needed

Review of Data: Annual by USAID/Ghana DG SO team and by GAIT II with citizen groups in targeted districts

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15

OTHER NOTES

GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-raboa-Coaltar and West Gonja.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		0	Indicator measures change in Cohort 1
2005	1		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	2		
2007	3		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			
<i>This sheet was last updated: May 5, 2005</i>			

SO5: Strengthened democratic and decentralized governance through civic involvement and increased

Intermediate Result 5.3: Improved Sectoral Advocacy Performance

Indicator 3: Number of targeted districts with an active women's wing in the Civic Union

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Targeted districts are the five GAIT II Cohort 1 districts selected at program start-up: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboia-Coaltar and West Gonja. Civic Unions (CUs) are civil society organization (CSO) umbrella groups at the district level. A women's wing is a CU body composed of women from CSOs participating in the civic union. A wing will be judged *active* if it meets four of the following six criteria:

1. Key leaders are elected
2. Holds regular meetings with minutes
3. Identifies an advocacy issue of importance to women and gets the issue on the CU advocacy agenda
4. Educates members of the community (via media and other means) on local and national issues of gender concern, such as domestic violence, girl child education, women's health, and economic livelihood
5. Gets at least one wing issue in the CU strategic action plan
6. Organizes at least quarterly activities of general interest to the community (Activity example: Brings in speakers to talk about issues concerning family health, schools and education, small scale enterprises, agricultural crop and marketing improvement.)

Unit of Measure: Targeted districts

Disaggregated by: The six criteria identified in the definition

Justification/Management Utility: GAIT II assumes that effective communities include women who are particularly active in civic roles. Strategies and activities to increase women's voice and space cut across all sectors. In many cases, men dominate executive positions of CUs and even women-dominated citizen groups, limiting women's space and voice in advocacy and civic action. Since women are affected by policies at the local level, increasing space and voice for women in civil society is imperative to advance advocacy issues in all sectors.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: On an annual basis (July), data gatherers, both external and internal raters, will interview key leaders of women's wings. On a periodic basis, GAIT II district technical assistants (DTAs) with community facilitators will review CU and Women's Wings records

Method of Acquisition by USAID: Completed interview guide from external data gatherers

Data Source(s): 1. Women's wing leaders; 2. CU and Women's Wings records

Method of Acquisition by USAID: GAIT II semi-annual and annual reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Baseline, November 2004; twice a year (March and July) by internal rating teams; and once a year (July) by external raters

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Nominal, funds included in GAIT II budget

Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID Local Government Specialist

Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GAIT II Team Leader

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: April 2005 by USAID

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Minimal record keeping systems within citizen groups

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Work with wings to organize their records to obtain information on regular basis. Reconfirm records of officers at baseline and revise with elections of new officers.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: To be determined by USAID

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot checks of data and further reliability checks by USAID.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: GAIT II M&E Unit determines if activities are being conducted based on wings' records. A wing will be judged "active" if it meets 4 of the 6 above-stated criteria. In consultation with citizen groups, DTAs and community facilitators, GAIT II core team analyzes data. Core team includes program team leader, M&E coordinator, local government and education advisors, zonal coordinators, Ghana Institute of Local Government Studies.

Presentation of Data: Tabular or graphical presentation of leadership positions occupied by women relative to gender distribution within membership

Review of Data: Annual by USAID/Ghana DG SO team and by GAIT II with CUs and women's wings in targeted districts

Reporting of Data: Two times per year, in semi-annual report by April 30 and in annual report by September 15

OTHER NOTES

GAIT II will work with a total 25 districts over its five-year program term (August 1, 2004-July 31, 2009). Districts are selected in three cohorts: Cohort 1 (five districts); Cohort 2 (10 districts); and Cohort 3 (10 districts). For the first three years, GAIT II reports performance for the specific districts in Cohort 1: Bole, Ho, South Tongu, Suhum-Kraboaa-Coaltar and West Gonja.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
Baseline (2004)		0	Indicator measures change in Cohort 1
2005	2		Start-up year, expect modest gains
2006	3		
2007	4		Last year for Cohort 1
2008			
2009			

This sheet was last updated: May 5, 2005